AF1834

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box  $\rightarrow$  [+]

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

March 3, 2003

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number **Application Number** 09/752,444 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date January 3, 2001 **FORM** be used for all correspondence after initial filing) First Named Inventor. Keisuke IMAI et al. Group Art Unit 2834 Examiner Name T. Lam Total Number of Pages in This Submission Attorney Docket Number 740165-278 ENCLOSURES (check all that apply) Fee Transmittal Form After Allowance Communication to Group Assignment Papers (for an Application) Appeal Communication to Board of Fee Attached Appeals and Interferences Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment / Reply Declaration and Power of Attorney ☐ After Final Licensing-related Papers Proprietary Information Status Letter Petition Affidavits/declaration(s) Application Data Sheet Petition to Convert to a Provisional Extension of Time Request Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Application Express Abandonment Request Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address Information Disclosure Statement Terminal Disclaimer Certified Copy of Priority Request for Refund Document(s) CD, Number of CD(s) Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 Remarks The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2380 (740165-278) for the above identified docket number.

or Individual name	Thomas W. Cole Nixon Peabody LLP 8180 Greensboro Drive Suite 800 McLean, VA 22102
Signature	Thomas Colo
Date	March 3, 2003

## 

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

Docket: 740165-278

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re	PATENT application of	· · )					
Keisuke IMAI et al. Serial No. 09/752,444 Filed: 01/03/01			Art Unit: 2834 Examiner: T. Lam				
				For:	ROLL CONNECTOR STRUCTURE		
					FOR A VEHICLE	)	

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on March 3, 2003.

April campbell

**RESPONSE AND REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION** 

HAR 19 2003 CHNOLOGY CENTER 28

**BOX AF** 

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

The following is presented in response to the final Office Action mailed November 29, 2002, which has been received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the new ground of rejection is respectfully requested for the reasons advanced in detail below. In light of the Examiner's refusal to grant an interview to discuss the Examiner's understanding of the detailed teachings of the Masuda ('782) reference and if the present § 103 rejection relying upon the Masuda reference is maintained, the Applicants respectfully request clarification of the teachings of Masuda ('782). Claims 1-4 remain pending.

NVA250517.1

- 1 -

With regard to the rejection to claims 1-4, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being obvious in view of the teachings of the admitted prior art (Figure 3) combined with the teachings of the newly cited Masuda ('782) reference, at pages 2-3, of the final Office Action, the Applicants are of the opinion the Examiner has misunderstood the teachings of the Masuda patent. Specifically, the Examiner states, at paragraph 2, of the Office Action that "Masuda discloses at least one steering switch (23,25) is connected to the rotor side casing (43) without wiring."

However, after a detailed review of the Masuda patent, it must be pointed out that Masuda (Figure 3) teaches a stator-side casing (column switch body 29, integral outer cylinder 31, and under cover 41) having affixed thereto a head lamp switch 23 and a wiper control switch 25 within slots (Figures 1 and 2; column 30-37) in the column switch body 29. The stator-side casing, i.e., the column switch body 29 and integral outer cylinder 31, is fixed relative to the steering column. The patentee also teaches a rotor-side casing (inner cylinder 33 and disk upper cover 43) attached to a steering wheel which includes a switch (squib-connection connector 53) electrically connected to the cable 35 via a connector at one end of the cable 35 (column 4, lines 11-21). Therefore, it is evident that the Masuda does not teach at least one steering wheel switch (squib-connection connector 53) connected to the rotor-side casing 43 without wires as presently claimed. The patentee instead teaches that the switches 23 and 25 are electrically connected to the stator-side casing, via collective connector 55 formed integral with the column switch body 29; while, the stator-side casing is formed of the column switch body 29, integral outer cylinder 31 and under cover 41 and has a separate wired connection to an electrical switch (squib-connection connector 53).

That is, the patentee, in direct contrast to the claimed invention, teaches that the connection of a steering wheel switch (squib-connection connector 53) is performed by connection of one end of the wire cable 35 to the switch (squib-connection connector 53). Masuda contains absolutely no teaching of electrically

connecting switches 23 and 25 to the rotor-side casing (inner cylinder 33 and disk upper cover 43).

As noted the Applicant's previous Amendment of June 19, 2002, M.P.E.P. Chapters 2142-2143.03 set forth that three basic criteria must be met by the prior art to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the reference(s). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination, and third, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), discussed above, fails to satisfy all three requirements above for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness since:

- 1. No reference or combination of references teaches or suggests <u>each</u> and <u>every</u> feature of claim 1 as outlined above, i.e., at least one steering wheel switch electrically connected to the rotor-side casing without wiring.
- 2. Nor does the proposed combination of references provide a reasonable expectation of success in that the combination proposed by the Examiner, if made, would not yield the device presently claimed, i.e., it would instead yield a steering wheel switch 53 connected via cable 35 to rotor-side casing 43. The proposed combination would in fact yield an apparatus which is the same as the instant admitted prior art shown in Figure 3.
- 3. Neither Masuda or the Examiner provide a suggestion or motivation for one of ordinary skill in the prior art to modify the admitted prior art to make an electrical connection of a steering wheel switch to a rotor-side casing without wiring as presently claimed.

For these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, under 35 U.S.C.

103(a), is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. However, if maintained, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specifically detail how the "at least one steering wheel switch (23, 25) is connected to the rotor side casing (43) without wiring" in Masuda.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas W. Cole Reg. No. 28,290

NIXON PEABODY LLP 8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800 McLean, Virginia 22102 (703) 770-9300 (703) 770-9400 fax

TWC/JWM